

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6 and 8-29 are pending in the application. In the claim set, claim 1 is in independent format. In the remarks that follow, Applicant first discusses independent claim 1 and then turns to the dependent claims of the claim set.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 14, 16-17, 19 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by 3GPP “3rd Generation Partnership project; Technical Specification Group Service and System Aspects; 3GPP system to Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) internetworking; System Description (Release 6)” Draft 3GPP TS 23.234 V1.10.0; May 2003 (2003-05), hereinafter referred to as “3 GPP.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites:

An interacting method for a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) user equipment (UE) fast selecting a mobile communication network to access in a WLAN interworking network, comprising the steps of:

initiating an authentication procedure after the connection between a WLAN UE and a WLAN Access Network (AN) is established;

sending a User Identity Request message to said WLAN UE;

on receiving said User Identity Request message, deciding network selection information to be carried based on the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE, and returning a message carrying said network selection information to said WLAN AN;

deciding whether said network selection information in the received message indicates a mobile communication network to which the WLAN AN is able to route an authentication request message, if yes, forwarding the authentication request message of said WLAN UE to the mobile communication network indicated in the network selection information, and otherwise, sending a notification signal to said WLAN UE, and directing said WLAN UE to perform subsequent operations.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserted that 3GPP teaches every element of claim 1 and cited a number of portions of 3GPP to support the rejection. Applicant has reviewed the cited portions and found no such teaching. Specifically, the Examiner pointed to 3GPP, page 33, and stated that that 3GPP discloses that “*on receiving said User Identity Request message, deciding network selection information to be carried based on the information of the WLAN*”

covering the WLAN UE and the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE, and returning a message carrying said network selection information to said WLAN AN” See the Office Action, page 3. In 3GPP, page 33, it is recited that “WLAN stores the keying material and authorisation information to be used in communication with the authenticated UE.” According to 3GPP, it is clearly depicted that “the keying material and authorisation information to be used in communication with the authenticated UE” is stored in the WLAN. Amended Claim 1, however, expressly states “deciding network selection information to be carried based on the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE.” Therefore, the teaching of storing the keying material and authorization information to be used in communication with the authenticated UE in the WLAN, as disclosed by 3GPP, should not be confused with the feature of claim 1.

In particular, the distinction between 3GPP and the claim is that 3GPP is directed to the WLAN storing the information, while the claim is directed to the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE. *The keying material and authorisation information* in 3GPP is different from the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE.

In addition, 3GPP merely teaches that “*3GPP AAA Server sends Diameter Access Accept message to WLAN. In this message 3GPP AAA Server includes EAP Success message, keying material derived from the EAP authentication as well as connection authorisation information (e.g. NAS Filter Rule or Tunnelling attributes) to the WLAN.*” However, Claim 1 recites “on receiving said User Identity Request message, deciding network selection information to be carried based on the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE, and returning a message carrying said network selection information to said WLAN AN.” 3GPP makes no mention of the steps of “deciding network selection information to be carried based on the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE, and returning a message carrying said network selection information to said WLAN AN” as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, 3GPP does not teach or suggest deciding network selection information to be carried based on the WLAN information stored in the WLAN UE and returning a message carrying said network selection information to said WLAN AN. For the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by 3GPP.

As for dependent claims 14, 16-17, 19 and 23-27, without conceding the Examiner’s assertions, Applicant points out that these claims depend from independent claims 1 and therefore include all of the limitations of that independent claim. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully submits that these dependent claims patentably distinguish from 3GPP for at least the reasons discussed above, and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 18, 20-22 and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of McIntosh et al. (US 20034/0139180 A1) and further view of Ahmavaara et al. (US No. 2004/0066769 A1).

McIntosh was cited to show “pre-configuring a mobile communications network with the highest priority to be accessed by WLAN UE” as recited in claim 2. McIntosh was further cited to show “obtaining the identity information of the current WLAN, matching it with that stored in WLAN UE” as the network selection to be carried as recited in claim 3. It was further cited to show “storing the identity information, otherwise, no storing is performed,” as in claim 4. McIntosh was also cited to show the limitation “wherein pre-configured mobile communication network with the highest priority is the home network” as in claim 5 and “wherein WLAN, APID or SSID is the media Access Control (MAC) address of the Access Point (AP)” of claim 6. In addition it was cited to show “setting a valid time for the stored network selection to make the stored contents invalid when overtime” of claim 8, “identity information of the WLAN exceeds the valid survival time, the highest priority to be carried, otherwise the valid time being consumed continuously” of claim 9 and “setting a threshold of the number of the information permitted to be stored in the WLAN UE, deleting old or selected information if information exceeds the threshold, otherwise storing the identity information of the WLAN” of claim 15. As relates to claim 20, McIntosh was cited to show “indicating to the WLAN UE that the current selected network is invalid and downloading the mobile communication information needed, sending information to WLAN UE, resending to WLAN AN.”

Ahmavaara was cited as disclosing the SIM and authentication protocol, “waiting for response message from WLAN UE for a certain time, if no response has been received, sending a Selection Result Request to WLAN UE” as in claim 18.

Claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0064741 of Haverinen. Haverinen was cited to show storing the identify information in the WLAN UE.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. As discussed above, 3GPP fails to disclose every element of independent claims 1. Neither McIntosh, Ahmavaara nor Haverinen make up for the deficiencies of 3GPP. In particular, they do not disclose the step of "deciding network selection information to be carried based on the information stored in the WLAN UE." Since claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 18, 20-22 and 28-29 depend from independent claim 1, they include all of the limitations of the independent claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 18, 20-22 and 28-29 patentably distinguish from any combination of 3GPP, McIntosh, Ahmavaara and Haverinen for at least the reasons discussed above. Consequently, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: June 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Melvin C. Garner

Registration No.: 26,272

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant